

because of the fact that tomorrow, and for weeks thereafter, the Senator will have ample opportunity to make his speech. We were hopeful that tomorrow a couple of speeches which have been prepared would be made.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Let me clear up the parliamentary situation. I mentioned the fact that I had the floor. I was about to speak on title VI. I do not want any Senator to say, "You have already spoken on title VI and you cannot speak on it any more."

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, under the circumstances, I shall not object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]. I always find him very persuasive. I was not aware of the information the Senator from Pennsylvania gave concerning what program the leadership on this bill and arranged in regard to the procedure for today. If I had known of it, I would not have said I was going to call for a live quorum. Under those circumstances, I will not call for a live quorum. But I respectfully suggest to the Senator from Pennsylvania, and through him to the floor leaders of the bill, that whenever it is possible, there should be the broadest possible cloakroom discussions of plans. We are likely, in the not too distant future, to find ourselves in a position in which each Senator may have to exercise his own right for his protection, regardless of any understanding some group in the Senate may have reached.

By announcing that I shall not ask for a live quorum at this time, I do not want Senators to think I am setting a precedent to guide them in the future. I shall not ask for a live quorum merely because the leadership may have entered into an understanding, of which I was not aware, that there would not be a live quorum.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I completely agree with the Senator. I point out only that since the Senator was out of the city on important business, arrangements had to be made before he returned. We did not not have an opportunity to call his attention—although we did inform a member of his staff—to the situation which had occurred on the floor. I am grateful for what he has done. I thank him for his understanding.

Mr. MORSE. It was perfectly proper for Senators to make those arrangements. I was called, as the Senator knows, at the University of Kansas and asked if I could return to make a major civil rights speech at 4 o'clock. I said I would, and I did.

PERSONAL STATEMENT BY SENATOR MORSE—SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, let me talk a little about South Vietnam. I shall base these remarks on a matter of personal privilege, because if Senators will look into the meaning of personal privi-

lege in the Senate, they will understand why I am basing my statement on a matter of personal privilege because of future reference.

Mr. President, the tinhorn soldier tyrant whom the Government of the United States is supporting in an unjustifiable war in South Vietnam has publicly called the senior Senator from Oregon a traitor.

I ask unanimous consent that the story appearing in the New York News, entitled "Khanh Labels Morse Traitor to U.S. People," written by staff correspondent of the News Mr. Joseph Fried, be published in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

KHANH LABELS MORSE TRAITOR TO U.S. PEOPLE

(By Joseph Fried)

SAIGON, VIETNAM, March 28.—Strongman Premier Maj. Gen. Nguyen Khanh today called Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, a traitor to his people for advocating withdrawal of U.S. advisers from Vietnam.

Khanh was questioned at the coastal city of Nha Trang, 200 miles northeast of Saigon, about Morse's recent statement on the Senate floor that "all of South Vietnam isn't worth the life of a single American boy."

DOESN'T KNOW SENATOR'S NAME

Khanh replied: "I do not know the name of this Senator. However, if I were an American, I can say this Senator would not be good for the American fighting men right here."

MORSE, he went on, is "a traitor of the American people" for taking such a view. He said he understood Red Chinese advisers were with Communist guerrilla cadres.

Khanh also spoke of Vietnamese-Cambodian relations after attending the graduation of a class of air cadets at Nha Trang.

SET TO WELCOME CAMBODIANS

He said he was ready to welcome a Cambodian delegation for talks on Vietnamese-Cambodian differences, but expressed hopes the two countries could settle their dispute without outside help.

Plans for early Cambodian-Vietnamese border talks fell through after the Vietnamese bombed and strafed a Cambodian village last week, killing some 16 villagers.

The News learned that the United States has begun supplying two-seater A-1H fighter planes to Vietnam to replace slower T-28 trainers. A shipment of A-1H's, formerly known as the AD-6, arrived here this week by ship. Other shipments will reportedly follow.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, that statement was made long enough ago for the White House to have had an adequate opportunity to reply to it. I want to know whether the President of the United States proposes to continue to give support to this tinhorn soldier tyrant in South Vietnam—a straight dictator. I want to know whether the President of the United States proposes to continue to allow the killing of American boys in support of this tyrant, in view of the fact that the tyrant publicly announced that an elected representative in the Senate of the United States of the free people of the State of Oregon is an alleged traitor.

I want to know what the position of my Government is on that charge; and I want to know it quickly.

I want to know what the position of

the President of the United States is on that charge, because the President of the United States is Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of this country, as well as President. I want to know whether or not the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of this country proposes to continue to give military support to this kind of tinhorn soldier tyrant in South Vietnam.

Freedom in South Vietnam? The statement of this tyrant in South Vietnam shows the kind of political system that exists in South Vietnam. It is perfectly obvious that if in South Vietnam an official of the people stood up and criticized that government, the tyrant in South Vietnam would liquidate him.

That is the conception of freedom held by this tyrant whom the Government of the United States is supporting at the rate of a million and a half dollars a day, and at great loss of American blood.

The continuation of the support of this tyrant with American money and American blood cannot be justified by the President of the United States.

I shall call upon the American people to respond to this kind of support of a military dictator and tyrant, who is involved on one side of a civil war in South Vietnam.

I repeat what I have said before, and I shall continue to repeat it. I discussed it at length at the University of Kansas last night, and I shall discuss it on platform after platform in this country in the months ahead because, in my judgment, U.S. foreign policy is at the crossroads, and the American people will have to render a judgment as to whether the largess and blood of the United States will continue to be used to prosecute the McNamara war to strengthen tyranny in various parts of the world.

I am just as opposed to the type of Fascist military tyranny that this tinhorn soldier in South Vietnam symbolizes as I am opposed to Communist tyranny, because there are no human rights for the individual under either type of tyranny; and the end result is the same.

I also want to know from this administration how many men we have in American uniform in South Vietnam. The figure 15,000 or 15,500 continues to be used, but I have been advised that there are already 18,000 American boys over there. At least, that is the word that comes out of the Pentagon; and some of the press correspondents who sit above the clock in the front of the Chamber have so advised me again today.

Day before yesterday I asked the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee two questions for information, which we have the right to ask of any committee, to find out whether or not there are any plans by McNamara to prosecute the McNamara war in South Vietnam by sending marines, guerrilla trained. That is a rumor out of the Pentagon also. We do not have the answer yet. I wish to know what the answer is.

I have also asked the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee to notify the Pentagon—and I know he has done so—to keep us informed day by day as to the casualties suffered by American boys in South Vietnam, including not

only those unnecessarily slaughtered by this unjustifiable McNamara war, but also those who have been wounded.

I wish to make clear to the Senate that I shall look to it, on the basis of a resolution which will be introduced in the near future, to take its stand in regard to McNamara's war in South Vietnam. Senators' constituents are entitled to know where they stand. I have listened to the thunders of silence of the overwhelming majority of the Senate in regard to McNamara's war in South Vietnam. The time has come for the American people to know where their elected representatives in the Congress stand. If Senators are for it, let them rise and say so. If Senators are against it, give those of us who have been willing to lead out on the shocking program of the Johnson administration in respect to McNamara's war in South Vietnam some help to bring to an end this unjustifiable war in South Vietnam.

This is a war between the South Vietnamese. We have not been able to get a witness from the administration before the Foreign Relations Committee who can produce a scintilla of evidence that there are any foreign soldiers in South Vietnam other than U.S. soldiers. If U.S. soldiers were out of there, the evidence seems to be crystal clear that the war would be fought between the South Vietnamese, because whole families are split in civil war.

I yield to no man or woman in the Senate in my opposition to Communist totalitarianism, but I should like to see a little more evidence in the Senate that there is like opposition to Fascist totalitarianism or to military totalitarianism.

We prate about supporting freedom in the world. We are not supporting freedom in South Vietnam with American blood; we are supporting totalitarianism in South Vietnam with American blood. That is why we are losing prestige, standing, and face all over the world.

All around the world, hundreds of millions of people know that the United States talks a good game of freedom, but that its foreign policy, in too many particulars, does not practice it.

In a few days, there will be a meeting of SEATO in Manila, at long last—a good thing. I hope some good results will flow from it, because we are in South Vietnam as a result of the SEATO Treaty. That is the weak reed upon which we lean. In the SEATO Treaty, the United States and the other signatories thereto entered into what is known in foreign relations as a protocol agreement. This protocol agreement provides that the signatories to the treaty consider the South Vietnamese area an area of mutual concern and mutual interest. A regional agreement, designed to protect and promote the peace of an area, falls within the framework of the objectives of the United Nations; that is, such regional agreements are authorized. But, if we enter into such a regional pact, we should carry out its purpose. That is not being done under SEATO. So, if the original pact does not carry out the purpose of preserving the peace, the signatories to the United Nations have a duty to step in.

I am sorry that the United States has not exercised the lead in calling for an extraordinary meeting of the foreign ministers of the SEATO pact, to see what could be done to settle that conflict over there by the application of the rule of law, instead of by the application of American military force.

We are a great country to talk about how we stand for the application of the rule of law. When are we to start practicing it? We almost have to be dragged into every incident where the opportunity exists to practice our professions about standing for the rule of law. We tried to evade the issue in the Cyprus issue. The United States, along with Great Britain, tried to have the Cyprus issue handled by NATO. How? By the use of military intervention. Cyprus is not even a member of NATO; neither is South Vietnam, our puppet state. We brought it into being in 1954. Inasmuch as we brought it into being, we say we are in there because the Government asked us to come in.

What do we say about Russian military forces being in the countries of Eastern Europe? We say that they are Russian puppets. Russia has always excused its shocking and unconscionable course of action in Hungary, and elsewhere in Eastern Europe on the ground that it is in there because those governments want it there. That is as much nonsense as the excuse the United States gives for being in South Vietnam. The reasons given are phony. They are intellectually dishonest reasons. We should not be a party to such a course of action.

If the SEATO members do not wish to work out a program for bringing peace in South Vietnam short of killing people, we should take the case to the United Nations. The great danger is that the brush fire will be whipped into a prairie fire, and that there will be an international holocaust.

Unpopular as my position may be in some quarters within the administration and elsewhere, I shall continue to do what I can to keep faith with my basic tenet in the field of foreign policy, namely, my deep conviction that there is no hope for permanent peace, unless we are willing to substitute for the jungle law of military force the law of reason encompassed in the rule of law under international law.

Every time the opportunity comes to resort to the rule of reason as a substitute for the jungle law of force, we should do so. South Vietnam gives us our present opportunity.

As I have previously stated, I never criticize a foreign policy, or any other policy of my Government, without offering what I consider to be a constructive proposal or plan to take its place. Thus, for the past several weeks, I have been saying that we should try to use the peaceful procedures available to us through SEATO, to arrive at a peaceful accommodation for the ending of hostilities in South Vietnam. For want of a better descriptive term, I should like to see the foreign ministers representing the governments signatory to the SEATO Treaty try to arrange a form of SEATO trusteeship on South Vietnam.

We are putting ourselves in a rather weak position if we take the view that we ought to support the present gang that controls South Vietnam for their policies are policies of totalitarianism, policies of tyranny, policies of the police state.

I do not like to see my country associated with the support of that kind of policy. That is what McNamara is supporting in his war in South Vietnam.

If what I propose cannot be done—and I am not sure that it cannot be, because we do not know until we try, although the President of the Philippines does not offer me much encouragement or hope—we should go to the United Nations.

I pointed out that the President of the Philippines announced in Manila a few days ago that the United States should remain in South Vietnam, and urged that the United States continue using military might in South Vietnam. I had asked the President of the Philippines, "Where are the Philippine soldiers in South Vietnam?" I asked to what extent the Philippines were making any contribution to the cost of the operation in South Vietnam.

The President of the Philippines took umbrage. I did not expect him to send me flowers. He did not answer me on the facts, however. He talked about how the Philippines would be glad to send in troops in a joint SEATO action. He used the old diversionary technique of telling about past relationships and the support that the Philippines had given to the United States. We are duly appreciative of that. The Philippine record is glorious. However, that has nothing to do with the failure of the Philippines to propose a joint SEATO action, or a SEATO settlement, or to undertake unilateral action of the kind it recommends for the United States. Because a country has performed well in regard to other obligations does not excuse it from performing well with respect to the instant obligation.

So I say, in reply to the suggestion of the President of the Philippines that we should intensify the war in South Vietnam, that he is missing a great opportunity. He apparently thinks the way to settle the South Vietnam issue is to settle it with bullets and not with reason.

The President of the United States, in a great speech downtown a few days ago, used one of his favorite Biblical quotations about sitting down and reasoning together. I agree with him. That is what we ought to do. I agree that this great teaching of the President ought to apply to South Vietnam.

The President of the United States ought to take the lead in trying to get the SEATO nations to apply the rule of law for the settlement of the holocaust in South Vietnam along any line that falls within the framework of the application of procedures of international law to the peaceful settlement of disputes which threaten the peace of an area and thereby threaten the peace of the world. If it cannot be done through SEATO, we must try to do it through the United Nations. We must let the United Nations try its hand at ending the hostilities in South Vietnam and stopping the

killing of people. After all, no blood-letting will ever settle an issue. In the long run it can only entrench for the future intense hatred, when a vanquished party in a military program today will rise again, 10, 20, or 30 years from now. That is the history of so-called military victories.

Military victories seldom produce permanent peace. Military victories only entrench hatred. Sooner or later, like a volcano, that human hatred erupts. A military solution by the United States in South Vietnam can never bring about permanent peace, even though it would seem, after more sacrifice of life and the expenditure of more millions of dollars, to provide but a temporary victory. We ought to take the lead, if SEATO fails, in the United Nations, to try to arrive at a program under which a United Nations trusteeship could be established.

This gives De Gaulle an opportunity to deliver. It gives him an opportunity to deliver in SEATO, also. Let us not forget who signed the SEATO Treaty: France, Great Britain, Australia, New Zealand, Pakistan, Thailand, the Philippines, and the United States. Only the United States is in there. The only foreign soldiers in there are U.S. soldiers. The only foreign soldiers who are dying there are U.S. soldiers.

Do not Members of the Senate consider it strange that all of our alleged allies in the SEATO Treaty, who took the position in 1954 that this is an area of mutual concern and mutual interest, are doing nothing about it except egging the United States on—as the President of the Philippines is doing—to spend more blood and more money to bring to an end the bloodletting in the civil war in South Vietnam?

We ought to find out their reasons. We should know why that is so. I suggested in a speech on the floor of the Senate on the day before yesterday that perhaps they recognize that the white man is never going to be able to prevail in Asia, that the day of the white man in Asia is over.

Great Britain discovered it. France discovered it after killing thousands of the flower of its manhood in Indochina, even though, interestingly enough, we made available to France about a billion and a half dollars to help France conduct the war in Indochina. France was whipped. France was driven out. The people of France brought down a government in protest against the slaughter of the flower of French manhood in Indochina.

I would have my administration take note of the fact that that is an interesting pattern in the history of the world; when the mass of the people finally come to understand that a military course of action is resulting in the unjustifiable killing of their boys, they hold to an accountability the government that is responsible for the killing.

Mr. President, I have been in enough places in the United States in recent months, and I have heard from enough people in the United States in recent months in regard to the unjustifiable McNamara war in South Vietnam, to

satisfy me that there is rising a tide of resentment among the American people in respect to the unilateral action of the United States in conducting McNamara's war in South Vietnam. A great many people seem to be concerned about face saving and prestige. What a great opportunity the United States has to strengthen its prestige around the world, to storm the heights of world public opinion and approval, by saying, "We feel that what should be done is for the countries that have signed pacts seeking to bring an end to the threat to the peace in various parts of the world to join in trying to arrive at a peaceful accommodation of the war in South Vietnam." That is my plea. I am not talking about myths. I am talking about a blueprint proposal for bringing to an end what I consider a mistaken American policy.

I sincerely hope that my administration will reappraise, and quickly, McNamara's war in South Vietnam. I shall await the position of the President in regard to the statement of this tin-horn soldier, tyrant, dictator in South Vietnam charging a Member of the U.S. Senate with being a traitor. I want to know what the President's position is in regard to that conduct on the part of this tyrant in South Vietnam. I am going to give the Senate an opportunity to decide what their position is on it, too.

If we have reached the point now where we have gone so far down the road toward the support of totalitarianism in segments of American foreign policy that the totalitarians can proceed to attack and try to undermine the elected representatives of the free people of the United States and the Congress, those same people had better know it.

There is no doubt what their reaction will be if they find out that the administration of this Government will sit in silence while a tyrant whom they are supporting in an unjustifiable military action, proceeds to attack Members of the U.S. Senate as traitors simply because under our system of political freedom and constitutional rights, we Senators exercise the precious checking power which the Constitution gives to the Senate against what we consider to be a mistaken foreign policy and call the hand of tyrants such as the Premier General of South Vietnam.

Then, too, perhaps we had better ponder again that great letter of Thomas Jefferson to James Madison in 1787:

I hold it that a little rebellion now and then is a good thing, and as necessary in the political world as storms in the physical. Unsuccessful rebellions, indeed, generally establish the encroachments on the rights of the people which have produced them. An observation of this truth should render honest republican governors so mild in their punishment of rebellions as not to discourage them too much. It is a medicine necessary for the sound health of government.

That great early President of the United States recognized the importance to a healthy democracy of honest and sincere dissent in the Halls of this Government. This Senator from Oregon dissents on many things, but he can always be counted upon to fight just as hard in

support of a policy of his Government when he thinks that policy can be squared with the facts. I intend to continue to dissent in regard to the unjustifiable war in South Vietnam.

I do not think it is moral. I do not think that this war in South Vietnam, and American support of it, can be squared with American principles of ideals and morality. I intend to express that dissent.

President Jefferson in his historic notes on religion in 1776 wrote:

No wonder the oppressed should rebel, and they will continue to rebel and raise disturbance until their civil rights are fully restored to them and all partial distinctions, exclusions and incapacitations removed.

That is a fitting transition paragraph to the second item that I rise to discuss; namely, title III of the civil rights bill.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7152) to enforce the constitutional right to vote, to confer jurisdiction upon the district courts of the United States to provide injunctive relief against discrimination in public accommodations, to authorize the Attorney General to institute suits to protect constitutional rights in public facilities and public education, to extend the Commission on Civil Rights, to prevent discrimination in federally assisted programs, to establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity, and for other purposes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, no one can improve upon the great language of Thomas Jefferson in his historic notes. And I read the language again:

No wonder the oppressed should rebel, and they will continue to rebel and raise disturbance until their civil rights are fully restored to them and all partial distinctions, exclusions, and incapacitations removed.

That is the heart of the civil rights fight. That is what the civil rights fight is all about.

I said the other day—and it is a fitting introduction as a preface to my remarks this afternoon—that we must always square our governmental policy with our national ideals and our moral professions. I hold to the point of view that any time a government or a governmental policy cannot be squared with what we all know are sound, moral principles, that policy must be repudiated and changed. The great evil in the discrimination against Negroes in this country ever since the Emancipation Proclamation by reason of our failure to ever deliver the Constitution to them is discrimination that cannot be squared with the Golden Rule. I shall repeat it again and again. Those of us who are seeking to pass a civil rights bill are seeking, to apply the Golden Rule to the Negroes of this country.

We are seeking to keep faith with the principle of religious teaching that runs through all the religions of the world, based upon a belief in one God. Bring to me any of the great religious books which form the foundation teaching of all the major religions in the world—the Torah, the Koran, or the Bible—and I

will point out the Golden Rule. It is the moral teaching that all mankind throughout the ages has recognized, to define the relationship of man to man. What do we mean when sometimes we speak of an incident as an illustration of man's inhumanity to man? When we analyze such an incident, we find that the inhumanity existed because the Golden Rule was violated.

Our great teacher Jefferson appreciated that, for it is imbedded in the notes on religion from which I read an excerpt a moment ago as an introduction to my speech on civil rights tonight.

Mr. President, when all is said and done, the 14th amendment merely guarantees to the Negroes that we shall do unto them as we would be done by.

That is the spiritual teaching of the 14th amendment; and what a reflection it is on the history of this Republic that it has been denied and ignored, insofar as the Negroes are concerned, ever since the 14th amendment was adopted.

Mr. President, I may disagree with the President of the United States in regard to a few things, such as the McNamara war in South Vietnam; but I agree with the President on most things, and I fully agree with him on his courageous position on civil rights. Sometime next week—or perhaps I shall wait until Memorial Day, if this debate is still going on then—I shall read, word for word, here on the floor of the Senate, what I consider the greatest speech on civil rights ever uttered in this country since President Lincoln's great Emancipation Proclamation. I referred to the speech by the then Vice President of the United States, now the President of the United States, Lyndon B. Johnson, at Gettysburg, Pa., last Memorial Day. It needs to be read and read and read, over and over again, because when that speech is boiled down to its basic elements, one finds that it is about the Golden Rule—the rule of doing unto others as you would have them do unto you. That is what the great Johnson speech of last Memorial Day really means.

In that speech he made perfectly clear that we must deliver the Constitution of the United States to the Negroes of this country, because, as Jefferson forewarned in the statement of his which I read a few moments ago, when these precious moral rights are denied to minorities, one must expect a reaction of rebellion, or at least of civil disturbance.

I believe that today there confronts the American people on the domestic scene the most serious domestic crisis since 1862, for I believe there are tens upon tens upon tens of thousands of Negroes—not all of them young, but the great majority of them young—who have become imbued with the spirit of martyrdom. We should reflect on what history teaches about martyrdom; we should examine those pages of the history books and should read of the episodes which caused great numbers of martyrs to lay down their lives. We have failed too long to deliver the Constitution of the United States to the Negroes of America; and this may be our last opportunity to deliver it to them without the flowing of great quantities of human

blood, for I believe that the martyrs, or those who are holding the attitude of martyrs, among the colored population of this country are not going to wait any longer; they are ready to die for their constitutional rights; but they will not die alone. So I think that today the Senate has an obligation as solemn and as great as that which any Senate since 1862 has had.

All of us can recognize the host of complex problems that the belated deliverance of the Constitution of the United States to the Negroes will create in the next few years. I do not believe the delivery of the Constitution to the Negroes of America will result in immediate tranquillity throughout the Nation. Of course, it will not; but the alternative would be so much more serious and costly to our Republic that we must not think of any proposal to give the Negroes of this country anything less than their full constitutional rights.

Today, all the newspapers publish articles which include statements in response to the questions, "To what extent do you think the bill will be watered down? To what extent do you think compromises will be substituted for full deliverance of the Constitution?"

I say to the Members of the Senate that if they vote for the slightest watering down of the full constitutional rights of the Negroes of this country, such Senators will perform a great disservice to the Nation, and will have to assume their full share of the responsibility for the disturbances that will flow from a failure to give the Constitution in full to the Negroes of America.

Of course, Mr. President, all of us will have to make adjustments; but if we talk to the great Negro statesmen of the country, we find that they are well aware of the fact that there are many problems of a social, economic, and political nature that will arise in the next 10 or 20 years after the Constitution is delivered in 1964 to the Negroes of America. But that situation is a challenge to all of us to perform as citizen-statesmen; it is a challenge to all of us to recognize that, when all is said and done, all of our rights and liberties are, in the last analysis, dependent upon our keeping faith with the controlling principle of our system of self-government—namely, that ours is a government of laws, and that the laws must prevail.

It is neither easy nor pleasant to allude to what I consider to be the dangers involved in a failure to deliver the Constitution of the United States to the Negroes of America, for I still know that when one makes the statements I have made in the past 15 minutes on the floor of the Senate, those who wish to distort, misrepresent, and read intentions, meanings and implications into one's words that are not in fact there, one can be put in a light, in the eyes of some, that will cause him to be misunderstood. But we shall not serve our country well by running away from the ugly realities that are involved in this great problem and being unwilling to discuss them out in the open.

We hear a great deal of discussion in the cloakrooms of what I have been say-

ing on the floor of the Senate for the past 15 minutes. I have never been able to understand politicians who apparently feel that it is all right to discuss in the cloakrooms, problems involving the welfare of our people that are very ugly, frightening, disturbing and involving human relationships, but are unwilling to face them on the floor of the Senate, where they have an opportunity really to inform the American people of what they, as legislators, believe are really basic problems confronting us on the civil rights bill.

We cannot give consideration to what has been happening in Florida in the last couple of days without realizing that what I predict is true as to what will happen if we in the Senate try to duck passage of a bill that would give full deliverance of the Constitution to the Negroes. The warnings of Jefferson will be put into practice in the case of an aroused people who believe that wrongs are being done to them.

How much longer do Senators believe we can continue to use on the bodies of human beings hot shots that are ordinarily used on the bodies of cattle to help in loading them into trucks and corrals?

How much longer do Senators believe we can continue in various parts of the country to use police dogs on human beings who are exercising the precious tenet of Jefferson—the right to rebel when they think that tyranny has been substituted for freedom?

How much longer do Senators believe we can continue in our country using police brutality against Negroes when they demonstrate for the constitutional rights to which they are entitled as a matter of law, but which the Congress of the United States has never had the courage to guarantee to them by legislative implementation of the Constitution?

How much longer do Senators believe that that can go on without the blood-letting to which I earlier referred? I do not believe any longer. We have had it. Time is upon us. There is no time left. We shall either do it in the present session of the Congress or we must prepare for domestic disturbances that will shock not only the country, but the world.

We cannot set up in the United States a "Union of South Africa." The apartheid policy of the Union of South Africa no longer has a place in the United States. We have had it for too long.

Mr. President, I believe I have demonstrated over the years in my discussion of civil rights that I do not believe the civil rights problems is a problem of the Southern States alone. The civil rights problem is a problem of every State in the Republic.

Senators ought to read some of the mail that I have received from my own State. I am glad to say that I am satisfied that it represents a minority of public opinion. But even to have that minority of public opinion on the proposition of abdicating the denial of constitutional rights to the Negroes of our country grieves me. I find it difficult to understand.